

No. 21 Nov./Dec. 1968

Spearhead

one-shilling

FOR

Law and Order

**Peace
Through
Strength**

Britain First

**NATIONAL
FRONT**

EDITORIAL

Offices:-

The Nationalist Centre
Birkbeck Hill
London S.E.21
Editor
JOHN TYNDALL

Do You Want a Regular SPEARHEAD?

THIS issue of Spearhead comes to you some two weeks behind its scheduled date of publication—a great improvement on the past but still short of the bi-monthly frequency that has been promised and well short of the monthly basis at which we aim.

The question of whether we can achieve this greater frequency depends very much on you: you our readers and subscribers and you the groups who take quantities whole-

Our sales do not at the moment cover printing costs. We cannot get advertisements because of our uncompromising political position. Costs are kept down by all articles and editorial work being contributed free and much of the printing work undertaken at our end—also free. These make an enormous demand on the time of those concerned, particularly myself. The time factor as much as the money factor limits the scope of publication.

We have something unique in Britain: a patriotic magazine with a popular pictorial appeal and free of commercial pressures. In a country dominated by a politically and commercially controlled press with an almost totally internationalist outlook this is a thing that we must preserve and promote with every power we can summon.

We can only do this with greater sales and, for some time to come at least, more donations of MONEY. This means sympathetic active groups purchasing more copies, even if some have to be given out free; it means others making MORE and BIGGER contributions. I am sorry that this has to be continually asked, but if we are to keep up the work I have no alternative. I am in business myself and the time that I sacrifice when measured in terms of earning power is far more than the contributions that I expect from any one individual.

We have come a long way from our humble beginnings in 1964, but we must advance FAR FURTHER. Help us with the ammunition and you can be sure that we will.

Your Editor

U.S. Election

Nothing could be more sickening than the idea that the lives of Britons so frantically depend on the question of who is President of the United States of America that they should wish to be deluged morning, noon and night with the news of his election. No doubt it was in furtherance of this idea that our press and broadcasting services worked themselves into a state of near frenzy as polling day approached across the Atlantic recently. "Here is the latest news from the Presidential Election," commentators would chirp as they came on the air. Note the use of words. Not the AMERICAN Presidential Election—just the "Presidential Election". One might assume from such terminology that it was OUR President who was being elected. No doubt the B.B.C., whose newswriters choose their words carefully, were not unduly anxious to discourage this assumption.

Because we regard the question of the American Presidency as being strictly the business of the Americans the whole rigmarole would normally have been a gigantic bore. It was saved from becoming that by the intrusion of an extra factor into the proceedings. In the person of Governor George Wallace of Alabama, as third party candidate, our leftist oriented opinion media were provided with a villain so made to order as to be the envy of any Hollywood film producer. As soon as the candidacy of Wallace was announced it was worth following the campaign if just to watch the antics of press and T.V. in dealing with him.

The trouble was that anti-Wallace emotionalism among our pundits and commentators became so transparent that it was clearly seen to rule out any rational analysis of what the man stood for. Would-be smashers up of Wallace meetings were described as "peaceful hecklers". Stewards who declined to let them do their smashing were "stormtroops". As for Wallace himself, expressions such as "thug", "monster", "guttersnipe", and so on, appeared almost monotonously in the columns of the press, but the most popular way of answering the Wallace case seemed to be to parody his Alabama accent—a thing which no-one had apparently thought of doing before with Lyndon Johnson's equally prominent Texas accent. Enough quotations of "ah say this" and "ah say that" and it didn't matter what the poor fellow actually did say. He was an uncouth hillbilly, and not worth listening to. It is truly fascinating how the Left, which preens itself on being 'classless', resorts to the most repulsive class snobbery in order

to downgrade someone of whom it doesn't approve.

In fact to those of us persistent enough to grope through the vast piles of verbal dung that the propagandists heaped around the Wallace platform his case seemed a lot more commonsense than the platitudes of his more favoured rivals.

Better luck to him in 1972!

what

Establishment Man

Now appearing prominently in the bookshops and being discussed widely by the critics is the impressively bound autobiography "My Life", by Sir Oswald Mosley. Selling at 70s., it should earn handsome royalties for the author in view of the public interest created.

Why this unusually generous hearing for a man who in his time was an object of the bitterest hatred of the political and financial establishment, and from whom one prominent newspaper withdrew support overnight as a result of threats of boycott from certain business interests. Have this establishment and these interests ceased to exist? Hardly!

The truth is that Sir Oswald has become practically persona-grata today for the very good reason that the distinction between his policies and those of the establishment has become very much blurred. In world affairs he is an internationalist, favouring an even more total integration with Europe than the Government at this stage dares to espouse. With the old party system his quarrel has petered down to one of minor detail. On matters of race his views are no stronger than those of many Tories. The blackshirted monster of the 1930s has become today a rather mild political animal who now regrets most of the harsh things he said about the old political racket in former times.

In the meantime he bids for the support of the British people, while saying, to quote his book, that "it seems perfectly natural for me to live in France."

No doubt some of our Mosleyite readers—if there are any—will construe this impression as an attack, and will write in urging us to save such attacks for our enemies of the Left. Our answer to this would be that the ideas Sir Oswald appears to have adopted in recent times, so far as they make any sense at all, place him a good deal nearer to the Left than to ourselves. That anyone who has read his latest book should consider him some kind of 'ally' of ours is quite fantastic.

"A gifted man who took a wrong turning": this was the summary of one review in the press. One cannot better that — although where the 'wrong turning' lay might be a matter for dispute.

Red Herring

The "is-the-B.B.C.-biased?" serial gets funnier and funnier. First Anthony Wedgwood Benn accuses the broadcasters of anti-government prejudice. Then various notables, including Ray Gunter and Christopher

we

Mayhew, leap to the broadcasters' defence, using such colourful terms as 'frightening' to describe Mr. Benn's suggestion that the powers of broadcasting "are too important to be left to broadcasters".

In fact this controversy is centred around a red herring. This journal has more than once in the past produced ample evidence to refute the claim that the B.B.C. is in any way 'free' at all. Sir Hugh Greene was long ago acknowledged as being "deeply committed to the progressive Left". Systematically over the years, under his guidance, the broadcasting services have been filled with reporters, interviewers and commentators of approved left-wing credentials. All programmes dealing with current affairs have been presented with a decidedly leftist bias. Every conceivable variety of play, film and even comedy show has been put on with some slant that is favourable to the kind of spiritual climate which the Left strives to create.

With the appointment of Charles Curran to the post of B.B.C. Director General this trend has been continued. In our last issue we drew attention to Curran's self-confessed marxist background. Beyond any doubt the viewing and listening diet continues to reflect this.

The fact that the B.B.C. may choose to make tilts at particular personalities of the day, or even at whole administrations, is neither here nor there. Families may quarrel among themselves, and the left-intellectual family that presently dominates thought in Britain is no exception. Indeed if one institution of the Left can be seen to be in argument with the other the whole must surely benefit from the maintenance of the illusion that free controversy still exists. Under the protection of this illusion the monopoly of left-wing thinking on the really important issues can become tightened. Has this occurred to Messrs. Wedgwood Benn, Gunter, Mayhew and Co.? If not, they must be even more naive than they appear.

Mexico and After

Another Olympics has come and gone. Another phase in a familiar pattern has passed away.

As usual, we British have had our moments of excitement and pride, such as when David Hemery pulled off his remarkable world-beating performance in the 400 metres hurdles. As usual, these moments have seemed all the greater for being so few. When the overall tally of medals is reviewed, there can only be one verdict on the British performance — lamentable.

think...

The way in which these results have come about raises of course the well aired controversy as to the nature of the Olympic ethic. In Britain our ideal has always been the gifted amateur, who competes for fun, does his best on the occasion, but smiles gracefully in the event of defeat. In many countries abroad, and certainly in all of those who figure highly in the medal stakes, the amateur concept exists only on paper. Sport is massively sponsored by the State, or, as in America, by big business. Producing world champions is the goal, and to that goal every other consideration is placed second.

An immensely powerful argument can be made out for the superiority of the British concept; that it is the most natural, that it corresponds most closely to the original Olympic ideal, and that were it to be applied universally international sport would be a much happier affair.

Like most other 'liberal' concepts, however, this is wildly remote from modern reality. For better or for worse, sport at the Olympic level is today a ruthless struggle for national prestige in which those countries who come second best are generally rated that way in all matters.

This is perhaps not a rational standard of values. It is, however, one that we have to face — like many other indigestible facts of the present day world.

At the moment the predominating opinion among our sporting administrators is that this standard, and the philosophy underlying it, should be rejected. They are entitled to this opinion.

What they are not entitled to do, in our view, is to continue to expose Britain to humiliation in the athletic arenas of the world by virtue of having to compete under conditions of totally unfair handicap — which is what the present position amounts to.

Either we should retire from international competition and conduct our sports and games entirely within the happy go-lucky context of the village green — in which our traditional amateur philosophy would make absolute good sense — or, if we are going to continue in the Olympic arena, we should do so under conditions in which our athletes have a fully equal chance against the sponsored and drilled athletes of the leading sporting powers.

To our way of thinking it would be a sad moment if Britain opted out of the international sporting set-up, however imperfect it is. It has never been part of our tradition as a nation to shirk tough challenges.

And quite apart from Olympic medals the modern approach to sport has its other by-products. A nation whose youth is conditioned en-masse to athleticism is certain to be all the more fit and ready to perform at its best in every field of life.

Visitors to Britain a century ago used to comment upon the decidedly superior physique of our countrymen. A Spanish general made the same observation during Wellington's Peninsula campaigns. Unhappily this is not so today. While the British breed in the dominions maintains the same high standards, the Briton in the United Kingdom has become in large part a flabby, sickly type, underexercised and stuffed up with ghastly un-natural food.

It gives us no pleasure to say this, but it is no use ignoring it.

If national regeneration is to come it will entail more than just a change in political and economic policies. We must lick ourselves into shape as a nation, physically and mentally, and to do this we must have a lead from the top. Both our diet and recreational habits need drastic review, and a ministry which would undertake this task would be of decidedly more use than many of the ludicrously inflated ministries we have today.

Our Olympic failures would be easier to bear were they not an accurate reflection of our condition as a race generally. Were we in the future to achieve great Olympic success it would not be through the accident of producing a few dozen A1 freaks from out of a generally C3 populace; it would be the culmination of a nation-wide progression towards fitness, strength and a will-to-win approach to life.

That is why WE hope to see the Olympics when a British 'gold' is greeted, not with headlines, hysteria and exaggerated flag-waving, but as a matter of course — expected of one of the world's leading nations. In every respect that would be indicative of better times.

Prescription for Suicide

THE REALITY BEHIND 'BIRTH CONTROL'

JOHN TYNDALL

IN the ranks of today's self-styled 'progressive thinkers' there is unanimity on one thing if nothing else: the blessings of birth-control. Opinions may vary as to how birth-control should be applied. In the fore are those who talk of compulsory measures; in the rear those who advocate 'education' as the answer. The desirability of birth-control as such is not questioned. On the contrary, it is equated with every other symbol of an enlightened society.

Into this flower garden of blissful assumption a bomb was recently thrown, the reverberations of which are yet far from dying down. Pope Paul, against the hopes of probably the greater part of his flocks, and certainly a massive part of his priesthood, decreed that the regulation of life on this planet should remain the prerogative of God alone, acting through the ageless powers of nature that have directed history.

The storm that greeted this papal ruling could have been predicted with certainty in an age dominated by the belief that God and nature are less mighty forces than the intellectual tinkering of man. In fact the Pope, in bringing this issue to the point of decision, spotlighted a conflict which extends far beyond the field of birth-control itself. It is a conflict in which two diametrically opposed philosophies confront each other: on the one hand, the timeless philosophy of natural law; on the other, the synthetic philosophy of 'social science', which subordinates destiny, history, and the eternity of life itself to the whims and conveniences of the moment, and which arrogantly lays claim to a wisdom superior than the wisdom upon which the whole of creation itself is founded.

SELECTION

I am not a catholic, and I make no attempt to justify the Pope on catholic grounds. I am a strictly non-denominational person who is concerned for the preservation and growth of those forms of life, human, animal and plant, which nature in a process millions of years old has selected as the best. And if there is one thing that is abundantly clear to me it is that the birth-control philosophy, and all its artificial paraphanalia of pills and potions, is a direct reversal of this process, establishing as it does a system of selection based, not on biological quality, but on phoney man-made theories of 'justice' and 'rights' that never did and never will have any place in nature's scheme.

Today millions of us take the birth-control argument on face value. It is well that we should examine this argument in all its aspects and see where it leads.

Birth-control is defended on the grounds that many couples have larger families than they can afford and that as a result children are inadequately fed and clothed. When looked at from the purely sociological angle this argument may seem a strong one. Issue the pill, the argument goes, and families will be restricted to a size that the parents

can afford to keep.

All very fine — as long as we think of families purely in terms of numerical units, each likely to produce the same kind of children as the next. As long as the aggregate of children is kept down the sociologists are happy.

INEQUALITY

No-one seems to consider for a moment the wide disparity of gifts between one family and another. Family A may be of absolutely sound stock: physically robust, intelligent, industrious, and of excellent character. Family B, on the other hand, may have a background of disease, feeble-mindedness, indolence, criminality or — what is not uncommon — a combination of all of those things.

To the social scientists and 'family-planners' both these families are exactly the same. Birth-control is considered a good thing whether applied to one or the other. No account is taken of the different consequences of a high fertility rate in each.

As long as the meddling of the birth-controllers is absent things have a tendency to work out the best way for society. Families in the A category work their way up by their superior efforts to a situation of the greatest prosperity and security, and are therefore able to have plenty of children to inherit their desirable qualities. We get an abundant breeding of the best and most productive elements of the population.

For families such as B fate is less kind. The position in society is low and therefore so is the sustenance level. If children beyond a certain number are born their expectation of survival is not very great. In this way nature restricts within reasonable limits those parts of the populace which from the social point of view are the least desirable.

Between the two extremes of best and worst stock, between genius and imbecility, the broad masses of people arrange themselves by their performance in a kind of

hierarchical scale, and their capacity to rear offspring is roughly related to their success in life, and thus, in most if not all cases, to their latent abilities.

I say "most if not all" with deliberation, since one can be quite sure that someone with a political axe to grind will rush forward with exceptions to the rule — which indisputedly there are. My purpose is to point to a general trend, not to claim a hard and fast adherence to that trend in every case.

In this kind of development we obtain an overall tendency towards the greater increase in the better stocks — which is essential to any healthy evolution of the race.

AGAINST NATURE

Against this whole process of nature — at times brutal but from the point of view of civilisation infinitely wise — social science seeks to pit its own crackpot laws. The 'Pill' is prescribed for all without the slightest regard for differences in hereditary qualities — as indeed it can only be. The result in theory is that all will use it to an equal degree — bad enough. The result in practice is far worse. Surveys have shown that it is precisely the most accomplished elements of the population that make the most use of birth-control. The most ignorant and backward almost disregard it.

To anyone concerned with the ultimate future of the race — rather than the temporary convenience of the social system — the prospect that this trend presents is truly frightening. Bit by bit the proportion of intelligent, energetic and creative people in the population will go down, and likewise that of their opposites will go up.

As if this is not enough, as supplements to their campaign the social scientists have two other weapons which help to accelerate the process. Taxation is systematically scaled so as to penalise the most productive income groups. And now the aim is to scale family allowances in the same way. This was made clear in a recent speech by a senior government represent-

ative, who said: "In the cause of social justice we must see to it that preference in family allowances is given to those families most in need."

WRETCHED

Aside from being a good vote-catcher, just what does this mean? It can mean nothing else than that we are to extend the process of encouraging the multiplication of the most wretched at the expense of the most useful! The most highly qualified professional man, the dynamic business executive, the skilled factory worker and the most energetic farm or builder's labourer — these types of citizens who put themselves to the most trouble to bring home a decent wage packet at the end of the week, and who show the greatest res-

need not be disputed. But do they represent a greater social sore than the situation that would result, and is resulting, from absolute sexual license being given to all? The social contempt traditionally attached to the unmarried mother was not directed at the fact of motherhood itself but at the behaviour that led to it. Such behaviour was opposed, not out of the desire of the old to spoil the fun of the young (as it is generally represented as having been), but out of a general social recognition of the importance of the family as a prop of national stability. The threat to this institution is not made less by allowing sexual license but preventing the childbirth by which it is publicly exposed — any more than the interests of hygiene are served by sweeping filth under the carpet. Quite the contrary

by any religious denomination to recognise some divine purpose in the setting of moral and social limits upon the whims of the individual. The very link between sexual activity and procreation should suggest to the simplest mind that nature intended the two to stand in some kind of equation to one another, and that when this equation is thrown out of balance — as it must surely be in a 'pill' regulated society — man is offending against every rule that nature has created for him.

The only result that one can see in a society given to round-the-clock copulation, without the slightest restraints offered in the way of social consequences, is a drift to irretrievable decadence similar to that which overcame the patrician classes of falling Rome as they retired to their villas, having turned their backs on the world, and submerged themselves in a repulsive twilight of guzzling and debauchery. Is this the destiny to which we are being conditioned?

OVERPOPULATION

There is of course one major argument left to the birth-controllers, even when these issues have been examined and perhaps recognised. It is the argument of over-population, first — that Britain is over-populated, and second — that the world is over-populated.

That the world is over-populated may very well be true, and if it is not yet true there is no doubt that it could become true not so very far in the future. We may all agree on this. It is another thing entirely to suggest in practical terms what should be done about it. The first thing that must be recognised is that birth-control — even were it to have no harmful by-products such as those that have been discussed — simply is not having the effect of abating the population explosion. Despite the all-out efforts of a multiplicity of international agencies, the tide is not being halted, only minutely slowed down in some countries where state policy complies with the scheme. In other countries state policy is directed to the precise opposite. In Soviet Russia mothers are publicly honoured on the provision to the nation of the tenth child. In France President De Gaulle has made it clear that he desires more rather than less Frenchmen, and to that end generously helps every family willing to contribute to such an increase. Germany, under the Kaiser and Hitler, adhered to the same principles, and who is to say that a resurgent Reich of the future will not do likewise?

That there should be such nations which set some store on their future power and security in this competitive world, and



BRITAIN'S FUTURE
Birth Controllers Want To Curtail It

ponsibility in the administration of that wage packet once they have obtained it, they are to be given the least encouragement to increase their kind because not "in need". On the other hand the habitual loafer or dunderhead, who either will not or cannot apply himself to earning a steady living, or the fellow who, although he may work hard and bring home good money, throws most of it away on gambling or booze, will obtain every help in such matters because "in need". It is small wonder that the former species do not find large families worthwhile.

The future of Britain fills one with dread if this process is continued.

SOCIAL SORES

Switching their argument onto another level, the social scientists make much of the misery and embarrassment caused to unmarried mothers, and postulate the Pill as the logical answer to this social sore.

That unmarried mothers are a social sore

the provision of a carpet to hide filth from view is all the more certain to result in more of it being accumulated. The ignominy of illegitimate birth, brutal though it undoubtedly is to the child concerned, has at least had the virtue of serving as an agent of restraint to those tempted by the attractions of illicit intercourse. Without such restraint sex becomes available on a par with the products of a sixpenny slot-machine. In such a situation marriage and the family become meaningless.

SELF-RESTRAINT

The term 'self-restraint' has already been used and should be restated in capital letters — because on what else, in fact, is civilisation founded?

The very factor that has set man apart from the animal and raised him to the civilised plane is the inner discipline brought by mastery of mind over body, of the sense of responsibility over impulse, lust and indulgence. One does not have to be bound

which therefore wish not to be "thin on the ground" when times of great reckoning arise, should be no surprise to any of us who have taken the trouble to understand the rhythm of history. The international power stakes do not change with time; only the nations change which enter successfully into them. Powers themselves come and go; the relentless factor of power continues as ever.

Since the prospect of a world population explosion is something which must be faced as being beyond all our powers of control, the only question remaining is: who will survive such an explosion and who will not? It is relevant at this point to consider the second question: is Britain overpopulated?

There are two distinct answers — depending entirely on the context in which the question is put. Is Britain overpopulated in relation to the natural resources of the United Kingdom? Undoubtedly yes. Is Britain overpopulated in relation to the population trends among other world powers? Emphatically No!

China's 750 millions is a fact well enough known — as is the additional fact that this figure will become 1,000 million while most of us are alive. Russia's numbers now stand at 240 million — despite a wartime death roll equal to half the entire populace of England and Wales. America recently celebrated the birth of her 200 millionth child. Japan consists of over 100 millions — allied to a highly advanced industry and technology.

OUR FATE

If we in Britain are to spare our children, and perhaps indeed ourselves, the fate of a Czechoslovakia, steamrollered at 30 year intervals by neighbouring giants, it is difficult to see how we can regard our numbers as too high in a world of such aggregations.

And if a healthy population growth cannot be supported by the resources of the British Isles, the answer is not to opt for race sterility but to work for a greater distribution of population between Britain and the lands of British pedigree in the Commonwealth, while ensuring that between these lands and ourselves a strong mechanism of political and economic unity is developed with the result that in all vital moments of future history we act as one.

If we look for instance at Australia, a country occupying nearly 3 million square miles but inhabited by only 12 million people, and when we consider that it is both in Australia's interest and our own that these almost empty square miles are filled with British stock, who in his right mind can oppose the idea that a vigorous birth-rate among Britons is needed — always

provided that it is balanced by a high rate of migration overseas?

In view of the present day balance of power, with monster states now coming to the fore which make nonsense of the power dimensions in which we were accustomed to thinking in the nineteenth century, and with teeming coloured populations everywhere posing their own special threat to the bastions of white culture and stability, the encouragement of a low birth-rate in Britain is tantamount to a national death-wish, a retreat from history worthy only of nations who have condemned themselves to the bath-chair.

REVERSAL

How can this trend be reversed? Let this be made clear. We have no right to dictate to husbands and wives that they should have large families — any more than the present meddlers have a right to dictate small families. Nor have we any right to condemn couples for practising birth-control within the present social context. When achievement and success are penalised and idleness subsidised we should not be surprised that our most useful citizens find it inexpedient to multiply their own kind. What we have to create is an entire re-scaling of social benefits, which in turn must begin from a reassessment of social values. Skill and industry must once again meet with their rightful reward and large families among the skillful and industrious given economic encouragement rather than the reverse. In this way, while leaving the choice of family size to every individual husband and wife, we shall be recreating the conditions in which, of its own accord, population development will regain its former healthy momentum and direction.

Many other factors of course intrude into this issue which we have not the space to deal with here. Let us, however, summarise our task by a final restatement of aim: We want in Britain, not a declining birth-rate, but a vigorously increasing birth-rate — balanced by large scale emigration to the dominions overseas. We want, within a healthy numerical growth, a tendency towards the greatest increase in the most intelligent and most fit — thus enhancing quality at the same time as quantity.

To these aims — aims which are essentially linked with the continuity and growth of our civilisation — all ephemeral social considerations should be subordinated. What does it avail us, after all, if to make less weight of the domestic problems of today we endanger the entire future of the British race, both in terms of power and worth?

Do we as a nation steel ourselves to face life — or do we opt for suicide?

NF Training Scheme Begins

BEGINNING in December will be a series of classes organised under the newly instituted National Front leadership training scheme. The purpose of this scheme is to educate and train members in all aspects of political work relating to the general improvement of the NF as an active body. It is particularly aimed at finding and developing the competence of those members qualifying for responsible positions in the NF in the future.

The scheme will be concerned with both the theory and function of politics, the first consisting of imparting a thorough knowledge of the NF case and current affairs generally, the second dealing with activities, organisation and public speaking, etc.

We hope that members will make an effort to attend these classes, although we do not expect, bearing in mind the demands of existing activity, that they should feel obliged to come to every class.

The classes will take place at the Nationalist Centre, Birkbeck Hill, London S.E. 21. on Tuesdays and Thursdays, starting at 8 p.m. The programme for December/January is as follows:-

| | |
|-----------|---|
| Dec. 3rd | THE CASE FOR NATIONALISM |
| Dec. 5th | PUBLIC SPEAKING CLASS |
| Dec. 10th | KNOWING THE ENEMY |
| Dec. 12th | ARGUING THE NF CASE (1) |
| Dec. 17th | DISCUSSION OF CURRENT TOPICS |
| Dec. 19th | PUBLIC SPEAKING CLASS |
| | No classes to be held during Christmas and New Year period. |
| Jan. 2nd | PUBLIC SPEAKING CLASS |
| Jan. 7th | ECONOMIC AIMS OF NATIONALISM |
| Jan. 9th | ARGUING THE NF CASE (2) |
| Jan. 14th | THE ART OF PROPAGANDA |
| Jan. 16th | PUBLIC SPEAKING CLASS |
| Jan. 21st | DISCUSSION OF CURRENT TOPICS |
| Jan. 23rd | SOCIAL ISSUES AND POLICY |
| Jan. 28th | BRANCH ORGANISATION AND ACTIVITIES |
| Jan. 30th | PUBLIC SPEAKING CLASS |

Only National Front members are admitted to these classes, and all are required to produce their membership cards on entry.

'BRITAIN FIRST'

(Organ of South London National Front)

Price 6d.

available from:-

35 Lavender Gardens, London S.W.11

John Bean

The Assault on Western Culture

'BUM' has a poignant message for us all. It signifies the spirit of this new age of enlightenment, struggling to come into a world where entrenched bigotry still fights a rearguard action against the new and vital progressive art form. And who could fail to be moved by the sadness of the closing scenes of Aaron Schweinkopf's great drama, which opened at the Royal Court Theatre last night, when Abdul Ali, the 49 year-old Pakistani anti-hero, clad only in a Che Guevara cap, breaks wind on the stage. This simple act expressed more movingly than a thousand words the whole struggle against racialism, the H Bomb and the horrors of the Viet Nam war."

Spearhead readers may be somewhat shocked at this imaginary theatre critic's review. But is it all that imaginary in view of the 'rave' notices that have accompanied "Hair" and other extravaganzas of sewer life upon the London stage since the abolition of the Lord Chamberlain's censorship? After all, even our imaginary title is not particularly novel, bearing in mind that Miss Yoko Ono, the Japanese flat-mate of John Lennon, M.B.E., made a film, and sold it, consisting entirely of close-ups of 365 naked bottoms!

The Times wrote glowingly of "Hair": "There is plenty of blasphemy, perversion, and other material taboo. The unmistakable purpose of the show, behind its strobe light massacres and transvestite parades of Western heroes, is to send up a great hymn to freedom and love."

If The Times, a fitting organ of the New Establishment, was so taken with "Hair" it will be ecstatic about "Fortune and Men's Eyes", which has just opened at the Comedy Theatre. It is a savage, ugly play about men in certain American prisons who are assaulted by fellow prisoners using homosexual practices to degrade their victims.

The theatre critic of the Evening Standard writes: "The characters are callous, obscene creatures, oozing filth from their brains and bodies as naturally as perspiration. Queenie, played with vicious accuracy by Al Mancini, is an aggressive queer rippling with every nuance of sexual depravity."

Ugliness

These changes that we are seeing, not only in the theatre, but in the cinema, in television plays, in the 'best-selling' novels, in painting, sculpture and even modern architecture, have one common factor: they are an attack upon all that is beautiful and aesthetically pleasing, and an effort to substitute the cult of ugliness.

A culture is an organic whole, and for each race it takes its own form. What we are seeing is the supplanting of the Western art form — and also, to a lesser extent, such graceful art forms as the traditional Japanese and Indian — by a rootless non-form, symbolising the 'one-world' outlook of its promoters. For it is not happening by accident, but by design. Evidence of planned political manipulation can be seen among the exponents and originators of modern 'anarchist art'.

Dadaism

Unheard of by the mass of people, the vanguard of this onslaught against European art forms is 'Dada-ism', the weird 'modern art' which arose during the First World War and which has been vigorously sold to the Western world as something 'revolutionary' and therefore exciting and valuable. From its very beginning it has been associated with individuals who have been known Communists, and this applies to many of the London-based 'playrights' and 'producers' of today.

Dada-ism has its origins in the philosophy of Arthur Rimbaud, who in 1890 declared that his intention was "the destruction and suppression of history.....of traditional theatrical and architectural form," and that it was "excrement to the traditional world of criticism, teaching and the professions of Bayreuth, Florence..... Shakespeare, Goethe, Aeschylus, Wagner and Beethoven."

An early disciple of Rimbaud was Le Corbusier, who founded the Communist-Dada publication "L'Esprit" in Paris in the twenties.

"Destroy!"

Dr. E. L. Zurich, in an article exposing the link between Dada-ism and the 'modern art' attack upon our culture, published in the October 1967 issue of "African Outlook", states that in Le Corbusier's "L'Esprit" we find alongside a glorification of the revolu-



SYMPTOM OF 'LIBERAL' BRITAIN
Obscene Muck Which Most Countries Have
The Sense To Forbid

tionary murderers Marat and Lenin an injunction which reads as follows: "We must habituate ourselves to radicalism, to subscribe to this materialistical, atheistic and corrupt god.....we must destroy the heart of the old large towns....it isn't a matter of traditional forms, of the style of Louis XIV, of the Baroque, of the Gothic, of the whole heap of entrails of the decayed, revered carcasses.....fantastic, milliards should be invested in gigantic glass buildings in the heart of Paris."

Eradicated

In other words, the memories of European culture are to be eradicated, and with the annihilation of all historical souvenirs of racial culture, the forces of internationalism hope to destroy the ethnic and spiritual power which binds the individual to his family, his homeland and his race.

Thus the aim of 'modern art' is to prepare the way, mentally and culturally, for that de-nationalised world, that vast amorphous mass of miscegenated humanity which, controlled by UNO police troops, will represent the joint ideal of both Communism and the International Financial Power, and will constitute the final annihilation of the individual.

If this happens mankind will pass into a spiritual night that will last for centuries — if not forever.

UNITED WE

UNITED WE MARCH ON." That was the verdict passed by the membership at the Second Annual General Meeting of the National Front, held at Caxton Hall, London, on September 21st. During the foregoing months a campaign had been building up which threatened to undermine the hard won and delicately maintained unity upon which the NF had been founded. At the A.G.M. the head of the splinter faction responsible, Andrew Fountaine, challenged A.K. Chesterton for the leadership of the NF through

members' ballot. The result was an overwhelming victory for Mr. Chesterton by 316 votes to 20. With this decision the last vestiges of a threat from the splinter faction vanished and the unity of the NF was cemented as never before. The conference also authorised changes in the constitution aimed at increasing the running efficiency of the movement.

The large hall was packed to capacity and the speeches were greeted with great enthusiasm. We report two of the main ones here.

LEADER'S ADDRESS TO NF

Mr. Chairman—Fellow Members,

First of all I want to point out the terrible plight of this country, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

There are, we know, 650,000 troops occupying Czechoslovakia, and perhaps 1 million Russian troops in all lined up in depth against that country — and she is sorely besieged.

But I give you my assurance that her plight, with all those Russian tanks and that vast Russian artillery, is not more dire than the plight of Great Britain, not under duress from tanks or artillery, but from the bonds attached by the usury of the international moneylenders.

We have got to strangle that — or else they will strangle us. And they are in the process of strangling us today!

It is because of that reason, because of the warnings issued by Mr. Warburg, that we have cut down our historic role East of Suez — and just think what is done thereby. We have turned Australia and New Zealand over to the dollar wolves. We have absolutely surrendered our power to look after our own interests beyond 1971 in South East Asia, Malaya and so on. We have abandoned Aden to anarchy and chaos, and with it control over our own vital supplies of oil. We have done our best to punch South Africa on the nose and to annihilate Rhodesia, all because of the same international financial pressure — because there are no votes in the business, believe that." It is due solely to the stipulations of those who make these great stand-by credits — which are a nice euphemism for loans, the last being 2,000 million dollars, which The Times had the damned cheek to call "a shot in the arm for the Pound." My God! In Canada you have a Monsieur Trudeau, who has amazingly climbed up to the chief power in the course of about 3 years from nowhere except



A. K. CHESTERTON ADDRESSES A. G. M.

his Communist background. He has said that Canada need not worry about a republic during the next 4 or 5 years, the implication being that after that time Canada is going to become a republic and cut off her historic ties with this country.

Well, if only a vital spark can go forth from Britain we can still rally Australia, New Zealand and Canada to our side. As long as we give the impression of being finished we cannot hope for the friendship of anybody, because one doesn't help a lame duck — whatever the proverb may say!

And apart from all this damnable betrayal of British interests abroad there has been the British betrayal at home. While we have been getting rid of some of our finest types to New Zealand, to Canada and to South Africa, we have taken in by the hundreds of thousands — God knows what the figures are; no figures are kept — of coloured gentlemen who simply cannot make the grade where our British way of life is con-

cerned, and are hundreds of millions of years away from our ancient culture and traditions.

That is a problem with which the National Front promises faithfully to deal!

There is a second betrayal looming up in different parts. It is rather a question of rats leaving a sinking ship. There is a very big case to be made, in England as well as in Scotland and Wales, for a much larger measure of decentralisation. But that is a very different thing from trying to make war on England in favour of Scottish or Welsh or any other kind of nationalism. We have become great as a united nation, and we've got to fight these separatist trends with all our might, because their arrogance is increasing. Mrs. Ewing, who I think is the Scottish Nationalist member of parliament, asked whether the English would be allowed into Scotland in the event of Scottish 'independence', said: "oh yes, we shall be tolerant of all races and creeds!" Though I believe that all patriots, however much they may insist upon a proper measure of devolution, will strive for the essential unity of the British people.

This is why the Scots can rely on the English and the real Welsh, including those up there in the gallery, to back them in any measures they may take to prevent the disbanding of a magnificent, staunch regiment such as the Argylls.

Finally, the verdict of this meeting has been conclusive. If anybody wants to test it in a court of law let them do it. We have got all this number of people here as evidence, and I'm sure they won't be reluctant to come forward. Now that we have got this vote of confidence we are going ahead with these objectives to fight for this country as long as the last breath of life remains in us.

God help us all!

MARCH ON

THE most important activities of the past year involving the National Front were summed up by Mr. Denis Pirie in his progress report to the NF Conference.

One of the biggest demonstrations made by the NF, Mr. Pirie said, was that against the odious Beatles film "How I Won The War". The NF decided that it was time that the cries of 'provocation' that the Left were always using were exercised by Britons for a change, and this provocation to our ex-servicemen that the film represented was greeted with such protest that in less than 2 weeks the film was taken off the circuits and not shown again.

Prominent on the social side was the Annual Christmas Dinner, which was started the previous year and which it was hoped would become a regular NF function.

ELECTIONS

Probably the main activity, and the one which, Mr. Pirie said, had gained the most publicity during the year, was the Acton election, and here a great deal of credit, and the movement's thanks, was due to our candidate Andrew Fountaine for the very brave and hard working struggle that he put up on the NF's behalf. Mr. Fountaine had been backed by a very good team, which surprised the NF's opponents with its fine organisation.

Later on came the local elections, at which the NF put up 27 candidates, these gaining an average vote of 8 per-cent — 2 per-cent above our figure for Acton. We take lessons from this, Mr. Pirie said. The local elections were very good practice for our branches and again made valuable publicity.

MARCH

Mr. Pirie then spoke of the great march, engaged in by NF members along with those of other patriotic bodies, against immigration. On this march, he said, the NF was well to the fore and proved to be a steady-backbone.

Another small semi-social event in the Summer was a camp at Mr. Fountaine's estate in Narford, Norfolk. This was very successful, proving not only good fun but very useful politically.

In addition to these things, Mr. Pirie said, the NF had made its influence felt in Westminster, and many of its officers were quite 'au-fait' with the inside of the House of Commons. Details could not of course

be given but friends had been made in "pretty surprising places"

COURT VICTORY

Another instance of the NF's help to other organisations was the sterling backing given to the Free Speech Defence Committee, which made a really superb gesture in setting up the defence of four people charged

it's terribly valuable, because I would say that between 60 and 70 per-cent of the enquiries that we get in the National Front come as a direct result of people receiving our literature through the door, writing up and asking for more, and then joining us."

Sometimes members had been heard to say that the National Front could be more in the press than it is. This was true, Mr.

PROGRESS REPORT



DENIS PIRIE GIVES YEAR'S PROGRESS REPORT

under the infamous Race Relations Act and securing their acquittal — thus striking a great blow for free speech in Britain.

Within the movement, Mr. Pirie said, we have developed rapidly. The NF now had a Northern Liaison Committee and the movement was growing up nation-wide.

In Bristol the NF had been on television. Speakers had been to many Tory meetings to put the NF case, sowing seeds that, Mr. Pirie said, would result in "a grand harvest" being reaped later on. Also the NF message had been taken into many technical colleges and schools, as well as other academic bodies.

NEW GROUPS

Scarcely a week went by without a new branch or group being formed, and it was a wonderful feeling to be able to visit these branches and groups and find so many new faces appearing all the time. We must make better use of these people, Mr. Pirie said, in the movement's interest.

The NF during the year had distributed nearly a million pieces of literature. "It's rather unsung work," Mr. Pirie said, "but

Pirie said, but much publicity was obtained which was not generally known. "I have a filing cabinet," he said, "full of cuttings that have been collected over the last year. The message is going down!"

Full figures of membership could not be given for reasons of policy, but the fact was that the size of the movement had trebled.

BLEMISH

There had been, said Mr. Pirie in conclusion, one small blemish on the year, and that was the dispute between a senior officer on the Directorate and other members of that Directorate. "We will accept," he said, "that there was a genuinely felt dispute, but unfortunately it manifested itself in a way that we did not find particularly pleasant as an organisation." There was plenty of room in the NF for disagreement, but there must be an accepted way of dealing with such disagreement.

This affair had been the one small blemish on the year's activity and progress. "Apart from this," Mr. Pirie ended by saying, "everything in the garden is very rosy at the moment!"

THE subject of workers' participation is a favourite one among many National Front members. In this short article I would like to draw attention to some of the problems associated with the concept.

In Feudal times the peasant had his 'rights', such as a strip of land for the support of his family, grazing rights for his cattle, and so on. The member of a mediaeval craft guild had his rights too: rights to a controlled market, rights to a fixed price for his product.

But the worker in a modern capitalist society has no such privileges. His only protection against the vicissitudes of a market economy lies in the collective strength of his trade union or professional association, and even these cannot guarantee him a job if times are bad. Hence, faced with such anxieties, one can understand why there is in our movement such a clamour for a mechanism whereby the workers can have some control over their own industries.

Categories

What are these mechanisms? They fall, I would suggest, into three categories.

Firstly, there are the profit-sharing schemes. In these the workers are given a share in the profits of a company, either by receiving shares in the company or by being given a definite proportion of the company's total profits.

The second method proposed is that of giving the workers a say in the management of a company, either by way of regular meetings in which all aspects of company policy are discussed or by putting a repres-

WORKERS' PARTNERSHIP

Some Observations by
RAY SHENTON

entative of the workers on the board of directors.

Of these methods I believe that the former is preferable. Workers have never objected to something extra in their pay-packets. They have, on the other hand, objected to participation in the affairs of management. They do not seem to want to take responsibility for policy decisions as to such matters as the pricing and marketing of their product, and prefer in the main to work for the firm which gives them the best wage and conditions. Whether their attitude is right or wrong is not for me to say, but this seems to be the way things are in practice.

Dispute

Further, one notes a disturbing phenomenon from the worker's point of view when the second of these two methods is adopted. If there is a dispute between workers and management over wages and conditions there is a tendency for the bosses to say: "Look, chaps, what's the point of going on strike? You are shareholders, part owners of the company! To go on strike would be against your interests. It would affect profits and the market value of your shares and, most important of all, YOUR DIVIDENDS!"

Small wonder that many workers wriggle out of this dilemma by promptly selling their shares and then, having gained their independence, adopting the traditional militant attitude of the industrial disrupter.

Again, in the case of the worker-director difficulty arises in so far as instead of his representing workers' interests in an aggressive manner on the board he may simply acclimatise himself, not only to a director's salary, but to a director's attitude as well. And in turn the board, realising his close connection with the workers, may use him to communicate unpalatable decisions to the shop floor. "Look, Jim," they might say, "the lads would take this from you; they wouldn't take it from us. Tell them that we can't pay 'em any more this year. It's true that profits are up but we've got to put a lot of the money into reserves. Tell 'em something like that."

Best Method

By far the best method of worker's control that I would suggest is the third category—that in which we control the market for our goods in the form of an economic nationalism embracing a trading area of Britain and the White Commonwealth.

Most of our difficulties today are due to the unpredictability of the world market. If we were to restrict, by tariff agreements, our basic market to Australia, New Zealand, Canada, South Africa and Rhodesia we could introduce a great deal more certainty into our economic life, and we would not as a consequence be at the mercy of the world bankers. That is the process of workers' control that I would advocate.

Be A Subscriber!

Ensure that you always get your copy of Spearhead by placing yourself on our list of postal subscribers. Fill in your name and address below and send it, with the required subscription, to our offices at:-

THE NATIONALIST CENTRE - BIRKBECK HILL - LONDON S.E.21.

Name.....

Address

Copy to be sealed/unsealed. Enclosed subscription of

RATES (12 ISSUES):-

British Isles & Commonwealth: 18s.; Foreign: 18s. (unsealed); 31s. (sealed).
3 copies: Brit. & Comm.: 46/6d.; Foreign: 46/6d. (unsealed); 73s. (sealed).
5 copies: Brit. & Comm.: 77s.; Foreign: 77s. (unsealed); 133s. (sealed).

ALL CHEQUES SHOULD BE MADE OUT TO: SPEARHEAD

WEST ESSEX NEWS

(Organ of West Essex National Front)

Price 6d.

available from:-

70 GREENSTEAD AVENUE
WOODFORD GREEN, ESSEX

NF BADGES

Available to members only

Price 4s. (plus 6d. postage)

Write to:-

11 PALACE CHAMBERS
BRIDGE STREET, LONDON S.W.1.

CAR WINDOW STICKERS

"JOIN THE NATIONAL FRONT"
"SUPPORT RHODESIA"

Obtainable from:-

THE NATIONALIST CENTRE
BIRKBECK HILL, LONDON S.E.21.

GREATER BRITAIN

Some Political Aspects Examined

by DAVID RIDDELSDELL

JOHN TYNDALL'S excellent booklet: "Six Principles of British Nationalism" deserves a full size book of analysis, and indeed volumes could be written on every one of the six principles in question. An article of this size, therefore, can hardly do justice to the theme. It may, however, stimulate thought, and if so will have served its purpose.

On page-six of his booklet Mr. Tyndall begins a cogent and forceful argument for a Pan Britannic union of British states. The idea of such a union is not new. The older name for the policy, advocated by men such as Cecil Rhodes, Joseph Chamberlain, and the late Lord Beaverbrook was 'Imperial Federation'. It was the policy on which Chamberlain became Colonial Secretary in Lord Salisbury's last government. After the 1905 election, perhaps the greatest triumph for 'laissez-faire' capitalism in our electoral history, the Liberals swept home on a free trade ticket and the Conservatives put Imperial Federation into cold storage, from which it has never emerged into Conservative policy since. Nevertheless, it has never departed from the minds of many British people the world over, and many right-wing conservatives, including at least one M.P. in the present Parliament, are known to favour it. Arthur Bryant wrote in 1961, in an essay which later became part of the book: "A Choice for Destiny", that Imperial Federation would come in time (though he made the quite ludicrous mistake of including in his 'imperial' plans the United States of America!) Even Harold Wilson, having become detested through his Rhodesia policy, tried to curry favour with the electorate by offering Rhodesia a union with this country. What he did not tell the electorate was that it was to be a multi-racial union. Mr. William Brittain, Editor of "Time and Tide", has also long urged an 'Anglo-Saxon' union—although again the concept, like that of Bryant, includes the U.S.

UNITY

Mr. Tyndall is right to start his theme by emphasising political unity through

Commonwealth Government. He is also right to mention its responsibilities in detail. I would like to enlarge on these later.

Mr. Tyndall says that the powers of execution of such a government would be limited by the right of self-governing members to accept or reject its policies, but stresses that the fact that the British nations have an option of self-rule by some means of common control or of accepting foreign control would lead to common sense prevailing. With this I cannot agree. There would most certainly be disagreements, and the only way to ensure both a workable government and democratic control would be the creation of a Commonwealth Parliament—to which the Commonwealth Government would be answerable. This Parliament should have the fullness of the powers of all the sovereign dominions which were members, but should in general exercise powers only in the allotted fields. It should of course be able to raise its own revenue for defence and other such purposes. In particular, to it should be reserved all matters relating to the Crown and Succession, peace or war, defence, treaties or foreign relations, treason, race and nationality, trade, transcontinental communications, currency, weights and measures, trade marks, designs, merchandise marks, and copyright or patent rights. Colonies, including mandated territory, should be administered by the individual territorial governments.

CONSTITUTION

This should all be laid down in a Treaty of Union, the actual Parliament being established before the Treaty is drawn up and signed. This would ensure flexibility and also make sure that the imperial constitution was as far as possible an unwritten one. The need for definition of relations between the imperial and territorial governments would mean that the United Kingdom would need a written constitution. However, this would not be necessary (or desirable) until the actual union took place. The imperial ministers would be appointed by the Queen personally, the United Kingdom having a Governor General, like the

other dominions.

To ensure that the new government was representative — without changing the power of the Crown to dismiss a government without advice from anyone — an additional power should be introduced. The Queen should be empowered to call a referendum if she considered that the Government was getting out of touch with the electorate on any issue considered essential. This would mean that she would be able to act without being involved in party politics. Recent events have shown that the Monarchy needs to be strengthened in order to protect the representative system of government. On the other hand, government by referendum should not become the established practice, as it makes strong government impossible.

NEED

British history over the past hundred years underlines the need for a union broadly along these lines. The precise constitutional proposals put forward represent an individual view. What is important is the fundamental concept of union itself.

The trend towards separate enclaves has done great harm which has only been arrested by a later coming together. The Australian states learned this lesson in the 19th Century. Newfoundland found the course of separate status stormy and became a province of Canada in 1949. In 1923 Rhodesia voted for the status of a separate territory against the offer of becoming a province of the Union of South Africa, and is now engaged in a costly sanctions war in which she leans heavily on South Africa for support. Had Rhodesia voted to become a part of South Africa it would have helped considerably to heal the wounds of the Boer War, and faced with the British populations of Rhodesia and Natal the Afrikaner nationalists would have been a good deal less anxious to demand Afrikaner supremacy and a republic.

The unity of the British World is in fact a logical follow on from the movement of union in the British Isles. Our ancestors learned the lesson that the old divisions of these islands among the several tribes of British stock were in danger of handing us over to the foreign races of the European Continent. Elizabeth the First of England took a statesmanlike course in ensuring the succession to the English throne of the Scots King, James VI (later James I of England). Years before Pope Adrian IV had realised the necessity of British unity when he encouraged Henry II of England to assume the leadership of Ireland. The lessons of the past should be digested and their experience put into practice—NOW!

Lesson From Prague

HOW LEFT STRATEGY HAS CHANGED

by PATRIOT

NOw that the dust has had time to settle over the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in August, can we draw a clear picture of what has happened? Apart from the natural indignation that comes from seeing the big bully trample on the helpless midget, what serious political issues are involved in the Czech affair?

A possible pointer appeared in a tiny report in the Daily Express during October. "More than 3,000 Czechoslovak Jews," the report said, "have left their country since the Russian invasion and the exodus is continuing at 15 to 18 a day—spurred by fear of a crackdown on liberals."

This event seems to conform to the general pattern of 'anti-soviet' communism that has gathered ground in many places in recent years, and from which the Czech business cannot be viewed in isolation. In Poland Premier Gomulka recently attacked what he called the "Zionist influences" behind the liberal agitation there. In the Western student troubles such names as Cohn-Bendit, Geismar, Krivine, Konarski, Triesman, Klein, Adelstein and Wortis suggest a disproportionately large Jewish element among the ringleaders. In general the powerful voice of Jewry among the world's opinion media has welcomed the 'new-look' leftism wherever it has asserted itself.

What has caused Jewry, who by general consent and on the evidence of many of its leaders gave the prime impetus to the setting up of the first Soviet state in 1917—both in the rendering of financial backing and the provision of leadership cadres, to now encourage the usurping of sovietism and the rejection of the Moscow 'hard-line'? Many intricate factors may combine to provide the answer, some of which are too clandestine as yet to be known to us. We can only venture a broad guess at what has happened.

Genius

Throughout the ages in which the Jewish race has influenced the course of history and the political development of nations it has always been the mark of the genius of this race to excel and assert itself most

of all in conditions of revolution: in conditions, that is to say, in which the foremost political task at hand is to undermine and destroy the foundations of a state—as distinct from that of building it up. This is a statement of fact, not a condemnation,



PRAGUE DEMONSTRATORS
Genuine Patriots or Tools of the New Left?

since as there are both good and bad states the process of their destruction can be viewed as good or bad accordingly. For good or bad, for better or for worse, the Jewish political flair has as a rule been best adapted to the usurping of the old in society rather than the creation of the new. In the entire techniques of revolution, both on the intellectual and cultural level and on the level of mass organisation and agitation, the razor sharp Hebrew has by instinct been invariably two steps ahead of his gentile counterpart.

This flair was seen in all the years of activity that preceded the Revolution of 1917, both in Russia and outside, so that when the old Russia fell the bolshevik regime that arose out of its ruins was straightaway conspicuous by the enormously powerful Jewish element in its leadership. Almost all the main government figures except Lenin were Jews.

Not surprisingly, many Jewish thinkers saw this event as being the fulfillment of a

messianic prophecy whereby the descendants of Israel, through the instrument of communism, would assume the leadership of mankind towards a new ordering of the Earth. The overwhelmingly superior political skill shown by Jews in the process of revolution might have appeared to some to justify this interpretation.

Predominance Lost

As the Soviet system evolved, however, things began to work out differently. With the Stalin purges of the twenties and thirties the Jewish element in the U.S.S.R., while still remaining powerful, lost at least some of its former predominance. In the war against Hitler Jewish participation received a new stimulus but so also did the forces of

Russian nationalism, which had never been completely absent as an influence in Soviet society. In the years following the war this latter influence has if anything become stronger rather than weaker, and probably today plays no small part in shaping Soviet policy. Jewish representation, on the other hand, has become less and less, although it would be wildly premature to say that it has been eliminated.

How has Jewry, after gaining such a firm foothold in the first place, lost ground? In all probability for the same reasons as Jews were, and are, so effective within the forces of revolution and upheaval.

The Soviets, once they had made their revolution, were faced with the same basic tasks as those they had overthrown. A vast country had to be made to work, to be politically stable, economically viable and socially cohesive. In these tasks marxist theory was not enough, and in fact as things sorted themselves out marxist theory proved everywhere to be inconsistent with the

requirements of building the new Russia. The new Soviet hero became, not the revolutionary agitator stirring the workers to revolt against the management, but the kind of worker who would co-operate with the management in producing above his 'norm'; not the street rioter or bomb-thrower who would campaign to undermine authority, but the loyal official who would capably and efficiently wield authority.

When World War II came the same contrast showed itself. In the First War, fought on behalf of the Tsar, the role of the communists was to disrupt the war effort, discourage the patriotism of the troops and promote desertion—all of which they did with great effect. In the Second War, fought in defence of communism against the most powerful anti-communist force the world has ever known, the very opposite strategy was required. Patriotism had to be intensified, discipline strengthened and authority, order and morale everywhere firmly upheld. This called for a type of leadership and political instinct absolutely contrary to that which had reduced Russia to chaos prior to 1917.

In such circumstances it was inevitable that the elements that had controlled the communist movement in Russia up to its seizing of power should lose influence. Once the demolition of the old structure has been completed the demolition squad is no longer required. A new structure has to be built and therefore it is architects and builders, above all, who are needed. The new structure may have a different design, but the same basic skills and instincts are demanded for its erection.

Had Tsarist Russia been replaced by a

liberal democracy something entirely different might have happened. But conditions demanded an autocratic system which merely amounted to Tsarism in another form. These conditions proved unworkable for those who had done so much to bring them about.

Reappraisal

As far as the Jewish element is concerned what, in the view of this writer, has happened is that a fundamental reappraisal of role has taken place gradually over the past forty or fifty years. In Soviet Russia world Jewry created a Frankenstein monster that has got out of control. A new force of the far left has required to be created, being equally effective in its revolutionary flair but not containing the elements of authoritarianism that have characterised the Soviet system. Perhaps indeed the new view is one that favours revolution as a process that never ends, a permanent condition of affairs in which absolute democracy is supposed to exist, right down to factory floor and schoolroom, and no leader or 'boss' exists but everything is decided by majority vote after the most skillful mobrouser has done his work. These are the conditions in which history's most skillful revolutionaries, including as they have done many Jews, have been able to exert the greatest influence and power, and this is why the left-liberal forces, rather than the Moscow hard-liners, now appear to have the intellectual and active backing of Jews everywhere. This is why, in the writer's view, Jews have done so much to bring such men as Dubcek to the fore as well as to

encourage the student protest movement on both sides of the iron curtain.

Guide

These reflections provide no complete answer to the Czechoslovak issue, and probably no complete answer is yet possible on the facts available. What they are intended to do is to serve as some guide towards one of the most significant political trends of the day by spotlighting some of its vital sources of inspiration and support.

It has been said already and it should be repeated again that to speak of the Jewish revolutionary genius is not to condemn it. Revolutions are a part of the process of history and their desirability or undesirability depends on what they seek to replace and what in fact arises out of them. Whether the Jewish skill in revolution is for good or for ill must depend entirely on this consideration and what one's political viewpoint is. The point is the existence of this skill as a fact, and our understanding of it as a part of our general understanding of political events.

It must also be said that to describe the Jewish race as having a genius for revolutionary activity is not to say that all Jews are engaged in revolution. The majority live as ordinary citizens, not influencing political affairs one way or the other. As with everything, it is the actions of the MINORITY that make the world turn round and make of history a continual thing of flux.

A process important to history is taking place in the politics of our time. Whether we approve of it or are repelled by it, it is vital that we recognise and understand it.

HAVE YOU JOINED THE NATIONAL FRONT?

If not, send for forms today by filling in below

To the Secretary,
The National Front,
11 Palace Chambers, Bridge Street, London, S.W.1 (TRAfagar 3881)

NAME

ADDRESS

To the Editor

SIR: With reference to your feature on typewriters in the 'Buy British Corner', may I suggest that it would have been wiser to select as your adviser a person who knows a little more about typewriters than how to tap out his article.

Imperial, which you recommend as the only firm "with a completely British pedigree" is in fact an American concern. Like Underwood, it was formerly British. The only way, these days, to obtain a British machine is to buy a reconditioned model — or build it yourself.

Mrs. P. M. KNIGHT
London W.C. 1.

(Editor's note: You are right, Mrs. Knight; on checking we find that Imperial have been taken over by Litton Industries, U.S.A.)

SIR: I read with interest the article headed: "Czechoslovakia — Then and Now" in the last issue of Spearhead.

The only demonstrators that I saw on T.V. news film protesting outside the Soviet Embassy were Young Trotskyists and Ukrainian exiles.

Where were the indignant Young Conservatives and our so-called 'right-wing' members of parliament armed with petitions?

G. JONES
Wednesfield, Staffs

SIR: In the very unlikely situation of a European gold medal winner raising a white gloved fist upon the olympic winner's rostrum as a symbol of 'white power', it requires little mental effort to imagine the vitriol that would squirt from Fleet Street pens at such a manifestation of "racial bigotry". It would certainly contrast with the gentle tut-tuts and even sympathetic understanding extended by our press and T.V. commentators to the 'black power' demonstration put on by the American negro sprinters, which reached the point of nausea when we heard the fawning tones of a B.B.C. man from Mexico talking to Tommy Smith and John Carlos as if they were eminent world dignitaries — and this AFTER they had been given notice by olympic officials to leave the games.

A thing even less worthy of our sympathy is the exhibition of decadence put on by the Australian sprinter, Peter Norman, who had to make his little "me-too" gesture of support for Smith and Carlos. The

latter can be respected for the pride they show in being black. Norman can only be despised for his shame in being white.

Yes, and British decadence was well represented too with athlete John Whetton chiming in with his comment that "we all thought it was a bloody good show". No wonder, with a few notable exceptions, the British athletes would be lucky to get into the semi-finals of the egg-and-spoon race.

JOHN BEAN

Thornton Heath, Surrey

SIR: With reference to your authoritative article in the last issue of this magazine which dealt with the regional separatists in Great Britain, I should like, if I may, to draw your readers' attention to a continental precedent to this type of attempted political fragmentation.

In Weimar Republic Germany the breakdown of traditional loyalties, the economic chaos and the glaring inability of the old political parties to provide any solution to these ills, led to the rise of regional separatist movements similar to our own.

The most important of these movements were in the Rhineland and Bavaria. The Rhineland separatists were supported, for their own ends, by financial interests in France and it may be of interest to note in this context that a prominent Liberal recently accused Plaid Cymru, the Welsh party, of being financed by interests in the U.S.A. The other organisation was the Monarchist movement in Bavaria. Bavaria, like Scotland, has the tradition of being a dependent but separate monarchy within a larger state.

This separatist feeling posed for a time a very real threat to German territorial integrity but died away with the rise of the Nazi Party and the concept of an all German nationalism.

With the defeat of Hitler's Germany in 1945, the task of organising an administration became the responsibility of the occupying powers. The forms followed in their respective areas reflected their own political structures.

The Western allies decided upon the federal system to act as a check upon the power of the central government and to give each region an opportunity to look after its own local culture and economic interests. The pre-Nazi jig-saw puzzle of internal state divisions was scrapped in favour of larger regional units.

In the Soviet controlled eastern part of Germany a different method was adopted, this being the total abolition of the old German states, with their convoluted boundaries and territorial enclaves, and the introduction of a number of smaller, reg-

ularly shaped areas grouped about the major towns, in the manner of some British counties. This system was adopted for the opposite reasons to those behind the Western federal system.

Eastern Germany, like the peripheral regions of Scotland and Wales, also has the problem of a minority language. That part of Germany between the Elbe and the Oder was occupied in the ninth century by Slavonic speaking peoples. In the intervening period this population has been conquered and Germanised, but a remnant, the Sorbs, survives in the Spreewald, south of Berlin.

The Soviet controlled East German regime has relaxed the cultural persecution that this ancient Sorb language endured under the Prussian kings and their successors. Indeed, it has given it positive encouragement. The number of schools teaching Sorbian has risen markedly and many books and periodicals are now published in that tongue.

In conclusion, then, it will be seen that a number of solutions have been attempted at various times and in various places in Germany to alleviate local particularist feeling. It will also be seen that the survival of a Sorb language population of about 100,000 people, under a regime as centralised and as harsh as the East German Government, gives an indication of the invalidity of the claim that for Welsh or Scots Gaelic to survive in must be in a separate Wales or Scotland. However, the most obvious lesson is that for all their pre-war vociferousness the separatists in Germany did not succeed in rending the country apart and there is no reason why separatists should do so here.

Genuine nationalists live in the realms of real nations. Phoney regional 'nationalists' live in the realm of hallucinations.

VERITAS

Name and address withheld

SIR: In his masterly exposition of monetary realities — as opposed to the seditiously and fanatically propagated fables of the Financial Establishment — Mr. Williamson says that the Government does not seem to know why prices rise, nor how to stop them doing so.

May there not be another explanation: namely what the theologians call CULPABLE IGNORANCE?

Consider, Sir, Mr. Wilson's reply to a question in the House of Commons (Hansard January 27th 1968): ". . . . it is a long standing convention that we do not discuss the activities of individual banks, whether the Moscow Narodny or any other!!!"

KAIKHOSRU SHAPURJI SORABJI
Wareham, Dorset

'IT is believed that the chemical (ammonia) was thrown from paper cups..... a police sergeant was also hit in the face with ammonia when a bottle was thrown at him.'

The above quotations are from an article on the front page of a national daily which lay folded on the knee of a fellow commuter. Another bank job? Another post-office snatch? No — yet another example of the ever growing menace of groups of agitators attending football matches in this country.

I am not a football lover, but I do respect the enjoyment it gives to so many millions, and I am convinced that it is a small minority, and a minority motivated by more than just love for a football team, which is the nucleus of an upsurging anarchistic force a great deal more sinister and compelling. Could it be, I wonder, the same ubiquitous, cancer-like growth that is infiltrating into the universities of every nation in the West? The same evil which is forcing every democratic police force to have specially trained sections appearing more like things from outer space, with their anti-riot paraphanalia, than law enforcement officers?

COMMANDO FORCE

In France they have a police commando force of 20,000 men ready to quell any riot anywhere in the country. Called the 'Compagnie Republicaine de Securite', the men live with their families in wired camps outside every major town. Each carries a truncheon and a pistol, and every fifth man also has — wait for it! — A GRENADE THROWER! His American counterpart, the 'Sheriff', is armed to handle a virtual civil war. Besides carrying a high-powered AR15 rifle with telescopic sights, he also has tear gas rifles, bullets and canisters ready for immediate use. In Mexico, the city chosen to be host to the Olympic Games, they have had a virtual civil war. The Mexican constitution states that troops may never be used against the people. The Government formed the 'Grenaderos' to be used as a suppressive force, thereby plugging this gap in the constitution. Why are these various specialist bodies necessary? I suggest that we look back to the first few paragraphs of this article for the underlying answer.

Why have I started with quotations from a report on a football match and seemingly meandered off on a tangent concerning internal troubles in other countries. Simply because they are so closely related that the two appear to be inextricable from Communist overall policy — which is the systematic undermining of a nation's law and

Where Will All This Lead?



order through anarchy prior to complete take-over.

ANARCHISTS

At the moment our British bobby has only his helmet and his phlegmatic approach to protect him from these malcontents. One day, sometime in the not too distant future, the mob is not just going to be content with just throwing stones and sharpened pennies. There will be amongst them individuals alien to this country and determined anarchists. Firearms will be produced and policemen will die. No Chief Constable or the Metropolitan Commissioner will stand for his men being murdered without means of adequate protection or positive deterrent. Inevitably we shall have the equivalent of the Compagnie Republicaine de Securite and Grenaderos, not only at football matches, but at all public events. The long standing tradition of our unarmed police will have gone forever, destroyed by insidious, obnoxious plenipotentiaries of the Red menace.

GAS

The Home Office has pledged that the Police will never use such things as tear gas grenades to quell demonstrations. I suggest that because of the increasing persuasiveness of the professional rabble rouser on the crowd this pledge will have to be withdrawn by the Home Office, and the enemies of this country will have achieved a major victory.

I appreciate that although the readers of this journal are as one in the general principles concerning the running of this country, there will be sceptics among them concerning my prognostications regarding police/mob relationships, and the use of arms as one-upmanship for the agitator. I would ask these sceptics to cast their minds back to the considerable trouble outside the

Chinese Embassy earlier this year. Whilst the embassy staff antagonised and battled with the police, the Chinese had a photographer taking all appropriate shots which could be interpreted as "Fascist police methods". The only object missing from the scene to help substantiate their nefarious accusations was, of course, a firearm. What a field day the Chinese press would have had with photographs of our policemen armed and wielding riot batons!

From the minority group at the football ground to the massed demonstration, such as on October 27th, the nation is slowly but determinedly being led towards anarchy and eventual civil war.

GORDIUM
(Ex-Policeman)

'BUY BRITISH' CORNER

Are you one of Britain's many millions of motorists? Do you own a British car? If the answer is yes, are you sure that you are not buying foreign petrol most of the time?

If you buy from Esso or Mobilgas you are buying from companies of 100 per-cent American origin. The same is true of Cleveland, which is part of the Standard Oil (Esso) combine. Regent, a company begun in Britain, has long been bought up by the U.S. firm Caltex. Jet, another firm of British origin, is now U.S. owned.

The Fina firm is Belgian-owned. Total is French.

The nearest that you can get to a British brand among the bigger companies is from the Shell Group, which is Anglo-Dutch. This group includes, as well as the well known Shell brand, National Benzole and BP, the latter being partly owned by the Government.

BEHIND THE FACADE

by James Miller

As a result of 'Anti Vietnam' Day on October 27th the cost of police precautions ran to half-a-million pounds.

What a pity that the taxpayer had to foot the bill—instead of the organisations responsible for the rioting.

* * *

Recently the Queen made a visit to South America.

Why did she not take the opportunity to see her loyal subjects in the nearby Falkland Islands? No doubt on Government advice that it might 'offend' the Argentinos!

* * *

A man jailed in 1966 for attempted rape "of a particularly horrible kind", as the judge said, was released on parole from Horfield Prison, Bristol, after serving only two years and two months.

Recently he was sent back to prison for sex attacks on two women.

Another example of our 'liberal' attitude towards the dregs of society.

* * *

Spongiers off the welfare state can now collect £27 per week for doing nothing, a Daily Mail investigation showed recently. That £27 is of course tax-free.

Meanwhile a man who WORKS to earn £27 per week can forfeit up to six or seven pounds in taxation.

Is this what some people mean by 'progressive'?

* * *

Mishaps in our hospitals and other medical services have reached the highest figure ever, says a report of the Medical Defence Union. There were last year 44 cases of retained swabs and instruments and 33 wrong operations. £127,000 was paid out to patients in damages, including legal costs.

We are constantly reminded of what our medical services owe to overseas doctors and nurses.

Indeed!

* * *

About 100 new houses in Daventry, Northants, are empty because there are no jobs there for prospective occupants. The shortage of work is blamed upon the Board of Trade's refusal to allow industrial development certificates to firms which would have provided 2,000 jobs and an office

development certificate to a firm which would have employed a further 840.

* * *

Heroin cases in Britain are now doubling every 18 months, it was said at the annual conference of the Royal Institute of public Health and Hygiene recently.

And so it will continue until really savage penalties are imposed on those who promote drug traffic. The case of Dr. Petro provided an excellent opportunity for an example to be made in this respect, but no such opportunity was taken.

* * *

The World Bank is going to pay the bills to keep the Communist regime of Alexander Dubcek afloat. Under a plan being prepared by the new management of President Robert McNamara, Czechoslovakia is being invited to join the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund.

Perhaps we should hesitate before acclaiming Dubcek as a 'national liberator'.

* * *

Enoch Powell was enthusiastically hailed at a meeting recently as "the future Prime Minister of Britain."

The occasion? A dinner attended by 250 big time financiers, nine tenths of them Americans.

An odd source of praise, surely!

* * *

A Biafran student was recently recommended for deportation for indecently assaulting a teenage girl and carrying an offensive weapon

Festus Azie, aged 37, of Westcliff-on-Sea, was said to have been living on assistance money since his arrival in Britain 12 years ago to study architecture. He was still studying.

Deportation? Right enough, but he should have served at least four years in jail first.

* * *

A 35 year-old Jamaican of Old Trafford, Manchester beat his 7 year-old son to death with a belt for coming home late from school. He was sentenced to 30 months imprisonment—no more!

* * *

Polygamy, which is banned among white Britons and is an offence punishable by imprisonment, is evidently justified if you happen to be a coloured immigrant. A three year survey by a residents' association revealed that 500 immigrants in Warley, Staffs, had more than one wife.

Apparently the Home Office seems completely unconcerned about this.

Unbelievable? Yes, but true.

THE Nationalist Book Centre

10 BIRKBECK HILL
LONDON S.E.21
01-670-0118

Open:-
Mon. to Fri. 7-10 p.m.
Sat. 2-6 p.m.

Send for Our Free Catalogue NOW!

(The Nationalist Book Centre incorporates both Kinsmen Books and Viking Books)

All patriots should read

CANDOUR

The British Views-Letter

Edited by A.K. Chesterton

Which supports the

NATIONAL FRONT

Published by the Candour Publishing Co.,
11 Palace Chambers, Bridge Street, London, S.W.1

"The New Unhappy Lords"

An exposure of power politics
By A. K. CHESTERTON

| | |
|---------------------|------|
| Cloth-Bound Edition | 25/- |
| Paper-back Edition | 10/6 |

THE NEW UNHAPPY LORDS is a must for the bookshelf of any student of modern politics. It represents the most lucid and startling of all commentaries on the methods of subversion being used to undermine Britain.
(from Nationalist Book Centre)

read...

Six Principles of British Nationalism

by
JOHN TYNDALL

Available now through our book-service. Price 1s.